Submission	No.		101						
Organisation Name or Name of Submitter			Gerard F Brouder (28 Oakley Park, Blackrock, Co. Dublin, A94 C7F6)						
Item No.	Section Ref.	Page No.	Observation Statement	TII Response					
RE: Railway (Metrolink-Estuary to Charlemont via Dublin Airport) Order 2022									
1	Letter	5	l wish to object to the above proposal on the following grounds: firstly, it is too expensive and secondly, it serves only to get from the Airport with no local links.	The Board is not responsible for any decisions in relation to the funding the Project. It is solely responsible for assessing whether the Project is consistent with proper planning and sustainable development and that its effects on the environment are acceptable. The responsibility for funding the Project lies with the NTA, the Government and ultimately the Oiroachtas. It has received all necessary approvals, including under the Public Spending Code for the making of a Railway Order: it will undergo further scrutivy and approvals, including under the Public Spending Code, before it is funded. It is not appropriate for the Board to make findings in relation to value-for-money that are outside its statutory functions and would cut across those arrangements. Members of the public are entitled to make representations to their TDs in relation to the value-for-money of any element of the Project. Need for the Project. The Information of the Project of the Information of I					

Submission No.	101
Organisation Name or Name of Submitter	Gerard F Brouder (28 Oakley Park, Blackrock, Co. Dublin, A94 C7F6)

Item No.	Section Ref.	Page No.	Observation Statement	TII Response			
RE: Railway (Metrolink-Estuary to Charlemont via Dublin Airport) Order 2022							
2	Letter	5	Could I suggest that the Bord have a look at the tram system in Bordeaux - there are no overhead power lines, the trams run on powered rail lines only activated when the tram is in motion. There are a number of interchanges where you can stay on the existing tram or change to another line. This system allows for local access with one fare for busses and the tram.	The observation is noted, but TII would bring to your attention the development of the Project as outlined in Chapter 3: Background to the MetroLink Project, section 3.6 Background to the Proposed Project. This section presents the project development and policy and strategy support for earlier revisions of MetroLink and the proposed Project presented in the Railway Order application. In the development of the proposed design for MetroLink and assessed in the EIAR submitted for this Railways Order, a number of alternative transport options were analysed to serve the Fingal/North Dublin Corridor. These are set out in EIAR Chapter 7, Consideration of Alternatives. The options assessed included for heavy rail, light rail Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) options, as well as potential combinations of options. These options were assessed in a two-stage analysis, based on feasibility of the option and on the consideration of whether the scheme meets the fundamental project objectives by serving Swords, Dublin Airport and the city centre. A Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) was undertaken having regard to Environment, Economy, Safety, Accessibility, and Social Inclusion and Integration. This assessment identified an Optimised Old Metro North as the best medium and long-term transport project for the Greater Dublin Area. The reasons for this choice are presented in section 7.3.2 of Chapter 7.			
3	Letter	5	I attach a drawing indicating a possible route with feeder links.	Till would note as referred to by responses (1) and (2) above that alternate alignments and systems have been considered before submitting proposals for the MetroLink project.			